

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 15, 20, 21, and 33 are amended. Claims 1, 5, 13, 15, 20, 21, 25, and 33 are independent claims. In view of the above amendments and following comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the various claim rejections.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's indicated that claims 5, 14, and 25 are allowed. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 is also allowable by virtue of its dependency on allowed claim 25.

Furthermore, the Examiner indicated that claims 13, 20, and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form (page 10 of the Office Action). Without conceding the validity of any outstanding rejection, Applicants have amended claims 13, 20, and 33 in independent form. Thus, claims 13, 20, and 33 are now in condition for allowance.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

#### **Mok/Evans Rejection**

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-17, 21-23, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,008,986 to Mok (hereafter "Mok") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,534,759 to Evans et al. (hereafter "Evans"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the validity of the outstanding rejections, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, and 21 in an effort to expedite prosecution. As amended, claims 1 and 21 recite an “operating [means/unit] capable of projecting forward to multiple desired positions within the automotive vehicle for use at **multiple projected positions**.” Similarly, amended claim 15 recites “projecting the operating unit forward to multiple desired positions within the automotive vehicle for use at multiple projected positions.” It is respectfully submitted that Mok and Evans fail to disclose such features.

In page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Mok’s keyboard as teaching the claimed operating means/unit. The Examiner further asserts that Mok’s disclosure shows the keyboard being projected forward.

However, Applicants submit that Mok teaches a **single position** to which the keyboard is slid out for use. In particular, Figs. 2 and 3 illustrate the particular position for using the keyboard, including the particular arrangement of the support plate 38 and stop 42 for supporting the keyboard at this position.

As such, Mok fails to disclose an operating unit capable of projecting forward to multiple positions for use at multiple projected positions, as required by claims 1 and 21. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Evans fails to remedy this deficiency in Mok because Evans fails to disclose an operating unit that projects forward (see col. 4, lines 25-30, teaching that the keyboard section 124 may only be folded up and down).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 15, and 21 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 7-9, 16, 17, 22, 23, and 27-29 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 15, and 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Mok/Evans/Batio Rejection

Claims 4, 6, 18, 24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok and Evans, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,643 to Batio (hereafter “Batio”). Applicants respectfully submit that Batio fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mok and Evans, which are set forth above in connection with independent claims 1, 15, and 21. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4, 6, 18, 24, and 26 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable claims 1, 15, and 21.

Mok/(Evans)/Ames Rejection

Page 9 (section 15) of the Office Action states that claims 10-12 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mok in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,787,040 to Ames et al. (hereafter “Ames”). However, it is evident from statements in this rejection that the Examiner intended to reject these claims based on the combination of Mok, Evans, and Ames.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ames fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mok and Evans, as set forth above in connection with independent claims 1 and 21. Thus, Applicants

Application No. 10/018,355  
Amendment dated September 8, 2005  
After Final Office Action of June 13, 2005

Docket No.: 1163-0380P

submit that claims 10-12 and 30-32 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claims 1 and 21.

### **Conclusion**

Entry of this Amendment After Final is respectfully requested. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in order to expedite prosecution.

Dated: September 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant